

FROM MATRIX TO OPERATOR INEQUALITIES

TERRY A. LORING

ABSTRACT. We generalize Löwner's method for proving that matrix monotone functions are operator monotone. The relation $x \leq y$ on bounded operators is our model for a definition for C^* -relations of being residually finite dimensional.

Our main result is a meta-theorem about theorems involving relations on bounded operators. If we can show there are residually finite dimensional relations involved, and verify a technical condition, then such a theorem will follow from its restriction to matrices.

Applications are shown regarding norms of exponentials, the norms of commutators and "positive" noncommutative $*$ -polynomials.

1. INTRODUCTION

Our topic is bounded operators that satisfy relations that involve algebraic relations, the operator norm, functional calculus and positivity. The word positive, when applied to matrices, shall mean positive semidefinite.

The $*$ -strong topology can bridge the gap between representations of relations by bounded operators on Hilbert space and representations by matrices. This feature of the $*$ -strong topology has been noted before, for example by Löwner in [2], or in the context of residually finite dimensional C^* -algebras in [9].

This article is essentially independent of our previous paper [13] on C^* -relations. We minimize the role of universal C^* -algebras. Perhaps someone will see how to strip out the C^* -algebras and get a result that works for norms other than the operator norm.

Theorem 3.6, our main result, a meta-theorem. We first define C^* -relation, and define on C^* -relations the concepts of closed and residually finite dimensional (RFD). The meta-theorem is that, given a theorem about matrices which states that an RFD C^* -relation implies a closed C^* -relation, we may conclude the same implication holds for all bounded operators.

The author is grateful for inspiring conversations with R. Bhatia, T. Shulman, V. Shulman and S. Silvestrov.

2. C^* -RELATIONS

Definition 2.1. Suppose $\mathcal{X}$ is a set. A statement R about functions $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ into various C^* -algebras is a C^* -relation if the following four axioms hold:

R1: the unique function $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0\}$ satisfies R ;

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 46L05, 47B99.

Key words and phrases. C^* -algebras, matrices, bounded operators, relations, operator norm, order, commutator, exponential, residually finite dimensional.

- R2:** if $\varphi : A \hookrightarrow B$ is an injective $*$ -homomorphism and $\varphi \circ f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ satisfies R for some f then $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ also satisfies R ;
- R3:** if $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is a $*$ -homomorphism and $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ satisfies R then $\varphi \circ f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow B$ also satisfies R ;
- R4f:** if $f_j : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A_j$ satisfy R for $j = 1, \dots, n$ then so does $f = \prod f_j$ where

$$f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \prod_{j=1}^n A_j$$

sends x to $\langle f_1(x), \dots, f_n(x) \rangle$.

Examples of C^* -relations include the zero-sets of $*$ -polynomials in noncommuting variables, henceforth called NC $*$ -polynomials.

When $\mathcal{X} = \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, the case we really care about, we use $a_1, \dots, a_m$ in place of the function notation $j(q) = a_q$. Given a NC $*$ -polynomial $p(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ with constant term zero, its zero-set is the C^* -relation

$$p(a_1, \dots, a_m) = 0.$$

Other C^* -relations associated to p include

$$p(a_1, \dots, a_m) \geq 0$$

and

$$\|p(a_1, \dots, a_m)\| \leq C$$

for a constant $C > 0$, as well as

$$\|p(a_1, \dots, a_m)\| < C.$$

Given a set $\mathcal{R}$ of C^* -relations, a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ to a C^* -algebra A is called a *representation of $\mathcal{R}$ in A* if every statement in $\mathcal{R}$ is true for f . A function $\iota : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow U$ into a C^* -algebra is *universal* for $\mathcal{R}$ if ι is a representation of $\mathcal{R}$ and for every representation $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ of $\mathcal{R}$ there is a unique $*$ -homomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow A$ so that $\varphi \circ \iota = f$.

It is important to note that often there is no universal C^* -algebra and no universal representation. See [13].

We use the notation $C^* \langle \mathcal{X} | \mathcal{R} \rangle$ for U and call it the universal C^* -algebra. Notice that universal representation ι is usually what we should be talking about. Notice also that ι need not be injective, but still we often say that the representation $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$ of $\mathcal{R}$ extends to a unique $*$ -homomorphism $\varphi : U \rightarrow A$ with the requirement $\varphi(\iota(x)) = f(x)$. A good exercise is to show that $\iota(\mathcal{X})$ must generate $C^* \langle \mathcal{X} | \mathcal{R} \rangle$ as a C^* -algebra. Alternately, this is clear from the proof of Theorem 2.6 in [13].

Given a set $\mathcal{R}$ of C^* -relations on a set $\mathcal{X}$, we let $\text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, A)$ denote the set of all representations of $\mathcal{X}$ in A . If $\mathbb{H}$ is a Hilbert space then we set

$$\text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H}) = \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})).$$

The notation

$$\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_{\lambda}$$

shall denote the C^* -algebra product consisting of all bounded sequences or families $\langle a_{\lambda} \rangle_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ that have a_{λ} in A_{λ} . Given a family of functions $f_{\lambda} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A_{\lambda}$ we say it is

bounded if $\sup_{\lambda} \|f_{\lambda}(x)\|$ is finite for all x in $\mathcal{X}$. For such a bounded family we define their *product* to be the function

$$\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} f_{\lambda} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} A_{\lambda}$$

that sends x to the family $\langle f_{\lambda}(x) \rangle$.

It could be argued that the above be called the sum of the representations, c.f. Section II.6.1 in [5]. Notice that given Hilbert spaces $\mathbb{H}_{\lambda}$ we have the inclusion (block diagonal)

$$\prod_{\lambda} \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H}_{\lambda}) \subseteq \mathbb{B}\left(\bigoplus_{\lambda} \mathbb{H}_{\lambda}\right).$$

A potential source of confusion is that we are talking about representations of relations in C^* -algebras, but then often want to represent various C^* -algebras on Hilbert space. Sometime we cut out the middle man and talk of representations of relations on Hilbert space. However, what we allow to be called C^* -relations on a set of operators are properties that can be determined by how they sit in the C^* -algebra they generate.

Definition 2.2. Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of C^* -relations on a set $\mathcal{X}$. We say $\mathcal{R}$ is *closed* if

R4b: for every bounded family $f_{\lambda} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A_{\lambda}$ of representations of $\mathcal{R}$ the product function $\prod f_{\lambda}$ is also a representation of $\mathcal{R}$.

We say $\mathcal{R}$ is *compact* if it satisfies the stronger axiom

R4: every family $f_{\lambda} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A_{\lambda}$ of representations of $\mathcal{R}$ is bounded and the associated product function $\prod f_{\lambda}$ is a representation of $\mathcal{R}$.

Following Hadwin, Kaonga, Mathes ([11]) Phillips ([17]) and others, we showed in [13] that $\mathcal{R}$ is compact if and only if there is a universal C^* -algebra for $\mathcal{R}$.

For example,

$$\{x^2 - x = 0, x^* - x = 0\}$$

is compact, and has universal C^* -algebra isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$. Also compact is

$$\left\{ \|x^2 - x\| \leq \frac{1}{8}, x^* - x = 0 \right\}$$

and this also has a universal C^* -algebra that is commutative. On the other hand

$$\{x^2 - x = 0\}$$

is closed but not compact, while

$$\left\{ \|x^2 - x\| < \frac{1}{8}, x^* - x = 0 \right\}$$

is not even closed.

It is sometimes easier to look at unital relations and unital C^* -algebras. Everything here carries over. Notice we are not putting 1 in $\mathcal{X}$, but use it symbolically in relations to stand for the unit in A when considering a function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow A$. Rather than introduce notation for this, we limit our discussion of unital relations to quoting other papers.

The relations associated to NC $*$ -polynomials are not the only interesting C^* -relations. The relation

$$0 \leq x \leq 1$$

is compact, with universal C^* -algebra $C_0(0, 1]$. Another relation on $\{x, y, z\}$ is

$$0 \leq \begin{bmatrix} y & x^* \\ x & z \end{bmatrix},$$

which is to be interpreted so that X, Y and Z in a C^* -algebra A form a representation if and only if the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} Y & X^* \\ X & Z \end{bmatrix}$$

is a positive element in $\mathbf{M}_2(A)$.

Many results about operators relative to the operator norm, or positivity, can be stated in the form where one set of C^* -relations implies another. For example

$$x^*x = xx^* \implies \begin{bmatrix} |x| & x^* \\ x & |x| \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$$

or

$$0 \leq k \leq 1, \|h\| \leq 1, \|hk - kh\| \leq \epsilon \implies \|hk^{\frac{1}{2}} - k^{\frac{1}{2}}h\| \leq \frac{5}{4}\epsilon$$

or

$$x^*x = xx^*, yx = xy \implies yx^* = x^*y.$$

In many cases, such a theorem will follow from the special case of that theorem restricted to the matrix case. Whether this leads to a new result, a shorter proof of a known result, or a new but harder proof of a known result, depends on the example. What seems interesting is just how many theorems in the literature involve C^* -relations that are residually finite dimensional.

3. RESIDUALLY FINITE DIMENSIONAL C^* -RELATIONS

We certainly want to look at relations that are compact and have universal C^* -algebra that is residually finite dimensional (RFD). For example, for some $0 < \epsilon \leq 2$ the relations

$$u^*u = uu^* = v^*v = vv^* = 1, \|uv - vu\| \leq \epsilon$$

have universal C^* -algebra that has been dubbed “the soft torus” by Exel, and this C^* -algebra has been shown to be residually finite dimensional by Eilers and Exel in [8].

A C^* -algebra is *residually finite dimensional* if there is a separating family of representations of A on finite dimensional Hilbert spaces.

The restriction to compact relations is artificial in operator theory. A very important example is the relation $\|xy + yx\| \leq \epsilon$ on $\{x, y\}$. (The obvious “and” operation turns a set of C^* -relations into a single relation, so we tend to use relation and set of relations interchangeably.) We could discuss RFD σ - C^* -algebras, but prefer to take as our starting point an alternate characterization of RFD C^* -algebras in [9].

On $\text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H})$ we will consider the pointwise $*$ -strong topology, whenever $\mathbb{H}$ is a Hilbert space and $\mathcal{R}$ is a C^* -relation on a set $\mathcal{X}$.

Compare this to

$$\text{rep}(A, \mathbb{H}) = \{\pi : A \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H}) \mid \pi \text{ is a } * \text{-homomorphism}\}$$

for a C^* -algebra A with the pointwise $*$ -strong topology. Equivalently, consider this with the pointwise strong topology. A representation π is said to be *finite dimensional* if its essential subspace is finite dimensional. The relevant result from [9] is that A is RFD if and only if for all $\mathbb{H}$ the finite dimensional representations are dense in $\text{rep}(A, \mathbb{H})$. For more characterizations of a C^* -algebra being RFD see [1].

We need a definition of finite dimensional for $f \in \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H})$. We define the *essential subspace* of f to be

$$\{\xi \in \mathbb{H} \mid f(x)\xi = (f(x))^* \xi = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\}^{\perp}.$$

We say f is *finite dimensional* if its essential subspace is finite dimensional. Notice this property has nothing to do with $\mathcal{R}$.

If $\mathcal{R}$ is a compact set of C^* -relations then the essential space of f is the same as the essential space of the associated representation π of $C^*\langle \mathcal{X} \mid \mathcal{R} \rangle$. Thus f is finite dimensional if and only if π is finite dimensional.

Definition 3.1. A set of C^* -relations $\mathcal{R}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ is *residually finite dimensional (RFD)* if there are finite constants

$$C(x, r) \quad (x \in X, r \in [0, \infty))$$

so that, for every $\mathbb{H}$ and any choice of nonnegative constants r_x , every $f \in \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H})$ satisfying

$$\|f(x)\| \leq r_x \quad (\forall x \in \mathcal{X})$$

is in the $*$ -strong closure of

$$\{g \in \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H}) \mid g \text{ is finite dimensional and } g(x) \leq C(x, r_x) \forall x \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

We say f in $\text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H})$ is *cyclic* if there is a vector ξ so that $A\xi$ is dense in $\mathbb{H}$, where $A = C^*(f(\mathcal{X}))$. Even if $A\xi$ is not dense, we call its closure a *cyclic subspace* for f . We say f is *unitarily equivalent* to g in $\text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{K})$ if there is a unitary $U : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}$ so that $g(x) = U^{-1}f(x)U$. If $\mathbb{K}$ is a reducing subspace for all operators in $f(\mathcal{X})$ then let U be the inclusion of $\mathbb{K}$ in $\mathbb{H}$ and let $g(x) = U^*f(x)U$. By **R3** this is also a representation and we call g a *subrepresentation* of f .

Lemma 3.2. Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of C^* -relations on $\mathcal{X}$. Every Hilbert space representation of $\mathcal{R}$ is unitarily equivalent to a product of cyclic representations.

Proof. The proof is almost identical to that of the same result for representations of C^* -algebras. $\square$

Lemma 3.3. A set $\mathcal{R}$ of C^* -relations is RFD if and only if there are finite constants $C(x, r)$ for $x \in X$ and $r \in [0, \infty)$ so that, for every $\mathbb{H}$, every cyclic $f \in \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H})$ is in the $*$ -strong closure of

$$\{g \in \text{rep}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathbb{H}) \mid g \text{ is finite dimensional and } g(x) \leq C(x, \|f(x)\|)\}.$$

Proof. The forward implication is obvious, so assume the condition on the cyclic representations holds for some choice of $C(x, r)$.

We may as well assume

$$f = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} f_{\gamma}$$

where f_λ is a cyclic representation on $\mathbb{H}_\gamma$ and $\mathbb{H} = \bigoplus \mathbb{H}_\gamma$. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ and $\xi = \langle \xi_\gamma \rangle$ is a unit vector. There is a finite set Γ_0 so that when we define $\eta = \langle \eta_\gamma \rangle$ by

$$\eta_\gamma = \begin{cases} \xi_\gamma & \text{if } \gamma \in \Gamma_0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \gamma \notin \Gamma_0 \end{cases}$$

we have $\|\xi - \eta\| \leq \delta$ for

$$\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{2} (\|f(x)\| + C(x, \|f(x)\|))^{-1}.$$

(Without loss of generality, $C(x, r) \neq 0$.) Suppose Γ_0 has q elements. For each γ in Γ_0 there is a finite dimensional representation $g_\gamma : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{H}_\gamma$ so that

$$\|g_\gamma(x)\| \leq C(x, \|f(x)\|)$$

and

$$\|g_\gamma(x)\xi_\gamma - f_\gamma(x)\xi_\gamma\|, \|(g_\gamma(x))^* \xi_\gamma - (f_\gamma(x))^* \xi_\gamma\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2q}.$$

For $\gamma \notin \Gamma_0$ set $g_\gamma(x) = 0$. Let $g = \prod_\gamma g_\gamma$, which is a representation, first in $\prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0} \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H}_\gamma)$ by **R4f**, and then on $\mathbb{H}$ by **R3**. It satisfies the norm condition since

$$\|g(x)\| = \sup_\gamma \|g_\gamma(x)\|.$$

The essential space of g is just the sum of the orthogonal essential spaces of the g_γ for $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$ and so g is also finite dimensional. For each x we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|g(x)\xi - f(x)\xi\| &\leq \|g(x) - f(x)\| \|\xi - \eta\| + \|g(x)\eta - f(x)\eta\| \\ &\leq (\|f(x)\| + C(x, \|f(x)\|)) \delta + \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0} \|g_\gamma(x)\xi_\gamma - f_\gamma(x)\xi_\gamma\| \\ &\leq (\|f(x)\| + C(x, \|f(x)\|)) \delta + q\rho \\ &= \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\|(g(x))^* \xi - (f(x))^* \xi\| \leq \epsilon.$$

□

Proposition 3.4. *If $\mathcal{R}$ is a compact set of C^* -relations on a set $\mathcal{R}$ then $\mathcal{R}$ is RFD if and only if $C^* \langle \mathcal{X} | \mathcal{R} \rangle$ is RFD.*

Proof. By the discussion above, this follows directly from Theorem 2.4 in [9]. □

Every C^* -algebra is isomorphic to the universal C^* -algebra of some C^* -relations, c.f. Section 2 in [13]. There is an abundant supply of RFD C^* -algebras and so an abundant supply of RFD C^* -relations. Examples include the subhomogeneous C^* -algebras.

Given a specific C^* -algebra it can be difficult to find a nice universal set of generator and relations. Conversely, given a set of C^* -relations, it can be difficult to get a description of its universal C^* -algebra that is more useful than the given universal property. For present purposes it is best to work directly with representations of C^* -relations.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ is a set of C^* -relations $\mathcal{R}$ on $\mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is closed and $\langle f_\lambda \rangle_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ is a bounded net in $\text{rep}(A, \mathbb{H})$ that converges to the function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})$ then $f \in \text{rep}(A, \mathbb{H})$.*

Proof. The key is noticing inside

$$\prod_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})$$

the C^* -algebra A of all bounded nets $\langle a_\lambda \rangle$ indexed by Λ that have $*$ -strong limits

$$L(\langle a_\lambda \rangle) = \lim_{\lambda} a_\lambda \quad (*\text{-strong}).$$

Recall, say from [5, I.3.2.1], that we need boundedness to gain joint continuity of multiplication in the $*$ -strong topology. Here we let λ range over the directed set Λ that indexes the net f_λ .

The f_λ form a bounded family of representations, so $\prod f_\lambda$ determines a representation of $\mathcal{R}$ in A . Now we use the naturality property for C^* -relations and conclude $f = L \circ \prod f_\lambda$ is a representation. $\square$

Now the main theorem.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ are C^* -relations on $\mathcal{X}$. If $\mathcal{R}$ is residually finite dimensional and $\mathcal{S}$ is closed, and if every finite-dimensional representation of $\mathcal{R}$ is a representation of $\mathcal{S}$, then every representation of $\mathcal{R}$ is a representation of $\mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Given a representation $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})$ of $\mathcal{R}$, the fact that $\mathcal{R}$ is RFD tells us that there are functions $f_\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})$ with finite dimensional essential spaces that are representations of $\mathcal{R}$ and so that $f_\lambda(x)$ converges $*$ -strongly to $f(x)$. By assumption, the f_λ are also representation of $\mathcal{S}$ and, since $\mathcal{S}$ is closed, we conclude that f is a representation of $\mathcal{S}$. $\square$

4. EXAMPLES

It is easy to find lots of closed C^* -relations. Here are enough to keep us busy while we attack the harder problem of finding RFD C^* -relations. Blackadar noted in [6] the importance of “softening” a relation $p(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ to $\|p(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| \leq \epsilon$.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is real number. If p is a NC $*$ -polynomial in $x_1, \dots, x_n$, with constant term zero, then each of*

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_1, \dots, x_n) &= 0, \\ p(x_1, \dots, x_n) &\geq 0, \\ \|p(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| &\leq \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

is a closed C^ -relation.*

Proof. Consider the last relation, for illustration. The other parts of the proof are similar.

Certainly

$$\|p(0, 0, 0, \dots, 0)\| = \|0\| = 0 \leq \epsilon.$$

The evaluation of a NC $*$ -polynomial does not depend on the ambient algebra. Therefore axiom **R2** holds.

NC $*$ -polynomials are natural, so **R3** holds.

Given families $\langle x_j^{(\lambda)} \rangle$ with

$$\sup_{\lambda} \|x_j^{(\lambda)}\| < \infty$$

we immediately get elements in the product C^* -algebra $\prod A_\lambda$. All NC $*$ -polynomials respect products, so

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| p \left(\langle x_1^{(\lambda)} \rangle, \langle x_2^{(\lambda)} \rangle, \langle x_3^{(\lambda)} \rangle, \dots, \langle x_n^{(\lambda)} \rangle \right) \right\| \\ &= \left\| \langle p(x_1^{(\lambda)}, x_2^{(\lambda)}, x_3^{(\lambda)}, \dots, x_n^{(\lambda)}) \rangle \right\| \\ &= \sup_\lambda \left\| p(x_1^{(\lambda)}, x_2^{(\lambda)}, x_3^{(\lambda)}, \dots, x_n^{(\lambda)}) \right\| \\ &\leq \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore **R4b** holds. $\square$

The relation that inspired this study is $x \leq y$, which is easily shown to be RFD using an approximate unit.

Proposition 4.2. *If f is a continuous, real-valued function on $[0, \infty)$, then*

$$\{x^* = x, y^* = y, f(x) \leq f(y)\}$$

is a closed set of C^ -relations.*

Proof. This follows from trivial facts such as $f(0) \leq f(0)$ and well-known facts about the functional calculus. $\square$

Proposition 4.3. *The relation $x = x^*$ is closed C^* -relation.*

Proof. This is a special case of Proposition 4.1 $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *The relation $0 \leq x$ is closed C^* -relation.*

Proof. A key fact about C^* -algebras is that positivity ($x = y^*y$ for some y) does not depend on the ambient C^* -algebra either. See, for example, Section 1.6.5 in [7]. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *If f is a holomorphic function on the complex plane and ϵ is real number such that $\epsilon \geq |f(0)|$ then $\|f(x)\| \leq \epsilon$ is a closed C^* -relation.*

Proof. The functional calculus is to be applied in the unitization of the ambient C^* -algebra. We know $f(0) = f(0)\mathbf{1}$ for the zero operator and so $\{0\}$ is a representation. The holomorphic functional calculus is natural, does not depend on the surrounding C^* -algebra, and respects finite products since polynomial do. $\square$

Proposition 4.6. *The union of two closed sets of C^* -relations on the same set is closed. If a set of C^* -relations on a set $\mathcal{X}$ is closed, the same properties applied to a larger set $\mathcal{Y} \supseteq \mathcal{X}$ form a closed set of C^* -relations.*

Proof. These statements should be obvious. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *If p is a NC $*$ -polynomial in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ with constant term zero, and give $t_1, \dots, t_m$ positive exponents and possibly repeated indices $j_1, \dots, j_m$, then*

$$\{x_j^* = x_j, p(x_{j_1}^{t_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}^{t_m}) \geq 0\}$$

is a closed set of C^ -relations. If only integer powers of x_r are used the relation $x_r^* = x_r$ may be dropped and the result is still a closed set of C^* -relations.*

Proof. Pile the functional calculus higher and deeper. Just to illustrate, we are talking about a relation such as $x^{\frac{1}{3}}yx^{\frac{2}{3}} \geq 0$ applied to pairs (x, y) of operators where x is positive. $\square$

Harder is the task of finding RFD relations. We start with the classic that kicked off this investigation.

Theorem 4.8. *The set of C^* -relations*

$$\{x^* = x, y^* = y, x \leq y\}$$

is RFD.

Proof. We dress Löwner's argument ([2]) in categorical clothing.

By Lemma 3.3 we need only consider representations on a separable Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$. Suppose x and y are bounded operators on $\mathbb{H}$ that are self-adjoint and that $x \leq y$. Let p_n be the projection onto the first n elements in some fixed orthonormal basis. Define $x_n = p_n x p_n$ and $y_n = p_n y p_n$ so that x_n and y_n have norms bounded by $\|x\|$ and $\|y\|$ and $0 \leq x_n \leq y_n$. The operators x and y form finite dimensional relations, and they converge $*$ -strongly to x and y . $\square$

Theorem 4.9. *Suppose $\beta > 0$ is a real number. The C^* -relation $\operatorname{Re} x \leq \beta$ is RFD.*

Proof. This is almost identical to the last proof. $\square$

Theorem 4.10. *Suppose $\beta > 1$ is a real number. The C^* -relation $\|e^{\operatorname{Re} x}\| \leq \beta$ is RFD.*

Proof. Since the real part of x is Hermitian, the exponential of the real part is hermitian with spectrum contained in the positive real line. Therefore $\|e^{\operatorname{Re} x}\| \leq e^\beta$ holds if and only if $e^{\operatorname{Re} x} \leq e^\beta$ which holds if and only if $\operatorname{Re} x \leq \ln(\beta)$. This relation has the same representations as the relation in Lemma 4.9, so must itself be RFD. $\square$

Theorem 4.11. *The empty set of relations on any set $\mathcal{X}$ is a closed C^* -relation.*

Proof. This is more-or-less contained in [10]. Given a Hilbert space $\mathbb{H}$ and operators a_j on $\mathbb{H}$ with $j \in \mathcal{X}$, take any net of finite-rank projections p_λ converging strongly to the identity. Then $p_\lambda a_j p_\lambda$ is bounded in norm by $\|a_j\|$ and converges $*$ -strongly to a_j . $\square$

Many amalgamated products $A *_C B$ turn out to be RFD when A and B are RFD. The simplest theorem of this sort, proved in [9], is that A and B being RFD implies $A * B$ is RFD. This generalizes easily here to something very useful.

Theorem 4.12. *Suppose $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}$ are disjoint sets. If $\mathcal{R}$ is an RFD set of C^* -relations on $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ is an RFD closed set of C^* -relations on $\mathcal{Y}$ then, regarding both sets as relations on $\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$, the set $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{S}$ is an RFD set of C^* -relations.*

Proof. All we need to know is that if A is a set of operators on $\mathbb{H}$ that are zero on the orthogonal complement of the finite dimensional subspace $\mathbb{H}_1$, and if B is a set of operators on $\mathbb{H}$ that are zero on the orthogonal complement of the finite dimensional subspace $\mathbb{H}_2$, then the union is a set of operators that is zero on the orthogonal complement of the subspace $\mathbb{H}_1 + \mathbb{H}_2$, which is also finite dimensional. $\square$

Proposition 4.13. *If $p_1, \dots, p_m$ are NC $*$ -polynomials in $x_1, \dots, x_n$, are homogeneous of degrees that can vary, and $\epsilon_s > 0$ are real constants and $0 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n$*

then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq x_j, \quad (j = 1, \dots, n_1) \\ x_j^* &= x_j, \quad (j = n_1 + 1, \dots, n_2) \\ \|p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| &\leq \epsilon_s \quad (s = 1, \dots, m) \end{aligned}$$

form a closed set of C^* -relations.

Proof. Assume $x_1, \dots, x_n$ are in $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{H})$ where $\mathbb{H}$ is separable and that these satisfy the above relations. Let u_k be a countable approximate identity for the compact operators, with $0 \leq u_k \leq 1$, that is quasi-central for $x_1, \dots, x_n$. Such an approximate identity exists by Corollary 3.12.16 in [15]. Applying a decreasing perturbation to each u_k we may further assume each u_k is finite-rank.

Let $x_{j,k} = u_k x_j u_k$. Clearly $\|x_{j,k}\| \leq \|x_j\|$ and $0 \leq x_{j,k}$ for $j \leq n_1$ and $x_{j,k}^* = x_{j,k}$ for $n_1 < j \leq n_2$. Also $x_{j,k} \rightarrow x_j$ in the $*$ -strong topology. For fixed k the $x_{j,k}$ all act as zero on the complement of range of u_k , which is finite dimensional. However, we need to modify the $x_{j,k}$ to make the last line of relations hold.

Suppose p_s is homogeneous of degree d_s . This means u_k appears $2d_s$ times in each monomial in p_s . Since u_k is quasi-central for the x_j we have

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k}) - u_k^{2d_s} p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})\| &= \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|u_k^{2d_s} p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\| \\ &\leq \|p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to show that if $a_\lambda \rightarrow a$ in the strong topology then

$$\liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \|a_\lambda\| \geq \|a\|.$$

The $x_{j,k}$ are bounded sequences converging to x_j in the $*$ -strong topology, so

$$\lim_k p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k}) = p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (*\text{-strong})$$

which means

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \|p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})\| = \|p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|.$$

If $p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ let $\alpha_{j,k} = 1$, and otherwise let

$$\alpha_{j,k} = \max \left(1, \left(\frac{\|p_s(x_1, \dots, x_n)\|}{\|p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})\|} \right)^{\frac{1}{d_s}} \right).$$

Let $y_{j,k} = \alpha_{j,k} x_{j,k}$. The $\alpha_{j,k}$ are at most 1 so $\|y_{j,k}\| \leq \|x_j\|$. We are scaling by positive factors so $0 \leq y_{j,k}$ for $j \leq n_1$ and $y_{j,k}^* = y_{j,k}$ for $n_1 < j \leq n_2$. Since $\alpha_{j,k} \rightarrow 1$ we see that $y_{j,k} \rightarrow x_j$ in the $*$ -strong topology. For fixed k the $y_{j,k}$ still all act as zero on the complement of range of u_k . What we have gained are the final relations,

$$\begin{aligned} \|p_s(y_{1,k}, \dots, y_{n,k})\| &= \|\alpha_{j,k}^{d_s} p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})\| \\ &= \alpha_{j,k}^{d_s} \|p_s(x_{1,k}, \dots, x_{n,k})\| \\ &\leq \epsilon_s. \end{aligned}$$

□

5. APPLICATIONS

We have several corollaries to Theorem 3.6. All these results refer to the operator norm or order relations. Of course, we recover the result of Löwner that matrix monotone for all orders implies operator monotone.

Corollary 5.1. *Let a be a bounded operator. Then*

$$\|e^a\| \leq \|e^{\operatorname{Re}(a)}\|.$$

Proof. Theorem IX.3.1 of [3] tells us this result is true for any matrix, and indeed with any unitarily invariant norm.

Since $\|e^x\| \geq 1$ for any operator x , we can rephrase this to say that for each $\alpha \geq 1$, we have

$$\|e^{\operatorname{Re}(a)}\| \leq \alpha \implies \|e^a\| \leq \alpha.$$

As the first relation is RFD and the second is closed, we are done by Theorem 3.6. $\square$

The NC *-polynomial version (in the original variables, not their fractional powers) of the following can be proven by Helton's sum-of-squares theorem, Theorem 1.1 in [14], which is essentially in [12].

Corollary 5.2. *Suppose that p is a NC *-polynomial in $x_1, \dots, x_n$ with constant term zero, and that $t_1, \dots, t_m$ are positive exponents and $j_1, \dots, j_m$ are between 1 and n . If*

$$p(x_{j_1}^{t_1}, \dots, x_{j_m}^{t_m}) \geq 0$$

for all self-adjoint matrices $x_1, \dots, x_n$ then the same hold true for all self-adjoint operators on Hilbert space. If only integer powers of x_r are used the relation $x_r^ = x_r$ may be dropped.*

Proof. The null set of relations is RFD so Theorem 3.6 still applies. $\square$

Corollary 5.3. *Let a, b and x be a bounded operators, with $a \geq 0$ and $b \geq 0$. Then, for $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$,*

$$\|a^\nu x b^{1-\nu} + a^{1-\nu} x b^\nu\| \leq \|ax + xb\|.$$

Proof. This is in [3] as Corollary IX.4.10, restricted to matrices but for any unitarily invariant norm. Using the operator norm version of that result, Proposition 4.13 and Proposition 4.7 we find again the the operator result follows from the matrix result. $\square$

Corollary 5.4. *If C is a constant so that*

$$(1) \quad \|a\| \leq 1 \text{ and } b \geq 0 \implies \|ab^{\frac{1}{2}} - b^{\frac{1}{2}}a\| \leq C \|ab - ba\|^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all matrices a and b , then (1) is true for all bounded operators on Hilbert space (or C^ -algebra elements).*

Proof. We all hope that the constant $C = 1$ works here, c.f. [4, 16]. Perhaps this reduction to the matrix case will make that easier to prove.

We can rephrase this as

$$\|a\| \leq 1, b \geq 0, \|ab - ba\| \leq \delta \implies \|ab^{\frac{1}{2}} - b^{\frac{1}{2}}a\| \leq C\delta^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The set of relations on the left is RFD by Proposition 4.13 and those on the right are closed by Proposition 4.7. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] R. J. Archbold. On residually finite-dimensional C^* -algebras. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 123(9):2935–2937, 1995.
- [2] Julius Bendat and Seymour Sherman. Monotone and convex operator functions. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 79:58–71, 1955.
- [3] Rajendra Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [4] Rajendra Bhatia and Fuad Kittaneh. Some inequalities for norms of commutators. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, 18(1):258–263, 1997.
- [5] B. Blackadar. *Operator algebras*, volume 122 of *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006. Theory of C^* -algebras and von Neumann algebras, Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, III.
- [6] Bruce Blackadar. Shape theory for C^* -algebras. *Math. Scand.*, 56(2):249–275, 1985.
- [7] Jacques Dixmier. *C^* -algebras*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1977. Translated from the French by Francis Jellet, North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 15.
- [8] Søren Eilers and Ruy Exel. Finite-dimensional representations of the soft torus. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 130(3):727–731 (electronic), 2002.
- [9] Ruy Exel and Terry A. Loring. Finite-dimensional representations of free product C^* -algebras. *Internat. J. Math.*, 3(4):469–476, 1992.
- [10] K. R. Goodearl and P. Menal. Free and residually finite-dimensional C^* -algebras. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 90(2):391–410, 1990.
- [11] Don Hadwin, Llolsten Kaonga, and Ben Mathes. Noncommutative continuous functions. *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 40(5):789–830, 2003.
- [12] J. William Helton. “Positive” noncommutative polynomials are sums of squares. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 156(2):675–694, 2002.
- [13] Terry A. Loring. C^* -algebra relations. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0807.4988>, 2008.
- [14] Scott McCullough and Mihai Putinar. Noncommutative sums of squares. *Pacific J. Math.*, 218(1):167–171, 2005.
- [15] Gert K. Pedersen. *C^* -algebras and their automorphism groups*, volume 14 of *London Mathematical Society Monographs*. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], London, 1979.
- [16] Gert K. Pedersen. A commutator inequality. In *Operator algebras, mathematical physics, and low-dimensional topology (Istanbul, 1991)*, volume 5 of *Res. Notes Math.*, pages 233–235. A K Peters, Wellesley, MA, 1993.
- [17] N. Christopher Phillips. Inverse limits of C^* -algebras and applications. In *Operator algebras and applications, Vol. 1*, volume 135 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 127–185. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87131, USA.

URL: <http://www.math.unm.edu/~loring/>